



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/701,551	11/06/2003	Young-Hoon Kim	1349.1316	8321
21171	7590	09/08/2008	EXAMINER	
STAAS & HALSEY LLP			WILLS, LAWRENCE E	
SUITE 700				
1201 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W.			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
WASHINGTON, DC 20005			2625	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			09/08/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/701,551	KIM, YOUNG-HOON
	Examiner	Art Unit
	LAWRENCE E. WILLS	2625

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 April 2008.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-22 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ . |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ . |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 6, 8, 12, 19, 20, 21, and 22 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sugawara et al. (US PG Pub No. 2002/0019848) in view of Harrison et al. (US Patent No. 6151623) .

Regarding claim 1, Sugawara'848 teaches an e-mail facsimile machine (Internet facsimile apparatus, paragraph 0038) connected to an e-mail server (number 1-12, Fig. 1, mail server, paragraph 0050) to send and to receive a scanned document (read image, paragraph 51) using an e-mail (read image sent by an E-mail, paragraph 51), comprising: a mail sending unit (number 1-5-2, Fig. 1, programs for controlling transmission of email, paragraph 0044) to convert the scanned document image to an e-mail format and to send the scanned document using the e-mail (an image of an original to be sent is read by the image reader 1-3, and the email accompanied by the read image is sent by an email transmissions control program, paragraph 0051) to the e-mail server (S1702, Fig. 17); a post-processing operation adding unit (number 1-2, Fig. 1, inputting

Art Unit: 2625

operation, paragraph 0041) to add a post-processing operation to the e-mail to be sent (the setting about whether the MDN is performed or not has been made by the user through the FAX operation unit 1-2, paragraph 0078, MDN is being viewed as the post processing); a mail receiving unit (number 1-5-2, Fig. 1, programs for controlling reception of email, paragraph 0044) to receive an e-mail from the e-mail server (receiving process to the mail server, paragraph 0199); and a post-processing operation implementing unit (number 1-2, Fig. 1) to check whether there is a post- processing operation designated in the received e-mail (S4-3, Fig. 4; checking whether the mail header accompanied by the MDN request header is ON or not, paragraph 137) and to implement the post-processing operation as designated (S4-5, Fig. 4).

Sugawara'848 fails to teach the addition of e-mail post-processing and performing post-processing of the email.

However, Harrison'623 teaches the addition of e-mail post processing and performing post-processing of the email (the agent in a server unit would append to the mail any activities the agent and/or rules have taken on the user's behalf. For example, if the user has a rule that states forward a copy on to Mary, then the Agent would append into the mail item a statement that says when the mail was received, which rule caused action to be taken, and what action was taken, column 2, lines 45-52).

Having a system of Sugawara'848 reference and then given the well-established teaching of Harrison'623 reference, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the internet facsimile system of Sugawara'848 reference to include the software intelligent agent as taught by Harrison'623 reference since each element

would have performed the same function as it does separately and the results of the combination would have been predictable.

Regarding claim 2, Sugawara'848 teaches wherein the post-processing operation adding unit uses a non-standard header (MDN request header, paragraph 0077) to add the post-processing operation to the e-mail to be sent (S3-4, Fig. 3).

Regarding claim 3, Sugawara'848 teaches wherein the post-processing operation implementing unit checks whether there is a post-processing operation designated in the non-standard header of the received e-mail (updated on the basis of the contents of the header of disposition, paragraph 0107).

Regarding claim 4, Sugawara'848 teaches wherein the post-processing operation is to delete the received e-mail located at the e-mail server (deleted, paragraph 0111).

Regarding claim 5, Sugawara'848 teaches wherein the post-processing operation is to forward the received e-mail to another e-mail address (transfer, paragraph 0111).

Regarding claim 6, Sugawara'848 teaches an e-mail facsimile post-processing method to add a post-processing operation to an e-mail to be sent using an e-mail facsimile machine (Internet facsimile apparatus, paragraph 0038) connected to an e-mail server (number 1-12, Fig. 1, mail server, paragraph 0050), comprising: selecting an e-mail sending menu (programs for controlling

Art Unit: 2625

transmission of the email, paragraph 0044, communication management information is formed each time the transmission by email are executed, paragraph 0058) and inputting address information of the e-mail to be sent (communication management information is formed each time the transmission by email are executed, paragraph 0058, further, information email address of the receiver is stored in the information); selecting a post-processing operation of the e-mail to be sent (MDN status of the transmitted email is stored, paragraph 0068); inputting information needed for the selected post-processing operation (parameters according to the processes of the email on the reception side are set into the disposition header, paragraph 0112); and sending the e-mail to the e-mail server (S1702, Fig. 17).

Sugawara'848 fails to teach the selection of e-mail post-processing and performing post-processing of the email based on inputted user information.

However, Harrison'623 teaches the selection of e-mail post processing and performing post-processing of the email based on inputted user information (the agent in a server unit would append to the mail any activities the agent and/or rules have taken on the user's behalf. For example, if the user has a rule that states forward a copy on to Mary, then the Agent would append into the mail item a statement that says when the mail was received, which rule caused action to be taken, and what action was taken, column 2, lines 45-52).

Having a system of Sugawara'848 reference and then given the well-established teaching of Harrison'623 reference, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the internet facsimile system of Sugawara'848 reference to include the software intelligent agent as taught by Harrison'623 reference since each element

would have performed the same function as it does separately and the results of the combination would have been predictable.

Regarding claim 7, Sugawara'848 teaches wherein the post-processing operation information inputted is recorded on a non-standard header of the e-mail to be sent (updated on the basis of the contents of the header of disposition, paragraph 0107).

Regarding claim 8, Sugawara'848 teaches an e-mail facsimile post-processing method using an e-mail facsimile machine (Internet facsimile apparatus, paragraph 0038) connected to an e-mail server (number 1-12, Fig. 1, mail server, paragraph 0050), comprising: receiving an e-mail from the e-mail server (S1707, Fig. 17, receiving process to the mail server, paragraph 0199); checking whether there is a post-processing operation designated in the received e-mail (S1710, Fig. 17) via an e-mail facsimile machine (Internet facsimile apparatus, paragraph 0038) connected to the e-mail server (number 1-12, Fig. 1, mail server, paragraph 0050); memorizing the post-processing operation (information indicative of a communication result is stored, paragraph 0068); printing out contents of the e-mail (printing, paragraph 0111); and implementing the memorized post-processing operation (processed, paragraph 0111).

Sugawara'848 fails to teach the checking of e-mail post-processing, memorizing e-mail post-processing and performing post-processing of the email.

However, Harrison'623 teaches the checking of e-mail post-processing, memorizing e-mail post-processing and performing post-processing of the email. (the agent in a server unit would append to the mail any activities the agent and/or rules have taken on the user's behalf. For

Art Unit: 2625

example, if the user has a rule that states forward a copy on to Mary, then the Agent would append into the mail item a statement that says when the mail was received, which rule caused action to be taken, and what action was taken, column 2, lines 45-52, in addition, number 86, 88, 92 of Fig. 5).

Having a system of Sugawara'848 reference and then given the well-established teaching of Harrison'623 reference, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the internet facsimile system of Sugawara'848 reference to include the software intelligent agent as taught by Harrison'623 reference since each element would have performed the same function as it does separately and the results of the combination would have been predictable.

Regarding claim 9, Sugawara'848 teaches wherein the post-processing operation checking operation checks a non-standard header of the received e-mail (S1711, Fig. 17).

Regarding claim 10, Sugawara'848 teaches the e-mail facsimile post-processing method as claimed in claim 8, wherein a sender is allowed to perform the post-processing operation (S1711, Fig 17, in addition processed, paragraph 0111) to the e-mail after the e- mail has been received and stored by the e-mail server of a receiver (S1702 and S1707, Fig 17).

Regarding claim 11, Sugawara'848 teaches wherein the post-processing operation adding unit allows a sender to perform a post-processing operation (S1711, Fig 17, in addition processed,

paragraph 0111) to the e-mail after the e-mail has been received and stored by the e-mail server of a receiver (S1702 and S1707, Fig 17).

Regarding claim 12, Sugawara'848 teaches an e-mail facsimile machine (Internet facsimile apparatus, paragraph 0038) connected to an e-mail server (number 1-12, Fig. 1, mail server, paragraph 0050), comprising: a mail sending unit (number 1-5-2, Fig. 1, programs for controlling transmission of email, paragraph 0044) to scan a document to convert the document to an e-mail (an image of an original to be sent is read by the image reader 1-3, and the email accompanied by the read image is sent by an email transmissions control program, paragraph 0051) and to allow addition of a specific post-processing operation to the e-mail to be sent by a sender (the setting about whether the MDN is performed or not has been made by the user through the FAX operation unit 1-2, paragraph 0078, MDN is being viewed as the post processing); and a mail receiving unit that receives e-mails received by the e-mail server (number 1-5-2, Fig. 1, programs for controlling reception of email, paragraph 0044) to print out the contents of the e-mail and perform the post-processing operation (printing and processed, paragraph 0111). Sugawara'848 fails to teach the addition of e-mail post-processing and performing post-processing of the email based on inputted user information.

However, Harrison'623 teaches the additon of e-mail post processing and performing post-processing of the email based on inputted user information (the agent in a server unit would append to the mail any activities the agent and/or rules have taken on the user's behalf. For example, if the user has a rule that states forward a copy on to Mary, then the Agent would

Art Unit: 2625

append into the mail item a statement that says when the mail was received, which rule caused action to be taken, and what action was taken, column 2, lines 45-52).

Having a system of Sugawara'848 reference and then given the well-established teaching of Harrison'623 reference, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the internet facsimile system of Sugawara'848 reference to include the software intelligent agent as taught by Harrison'623 reference since each element would have performed the same function as it does separately and the results of the combination would have been predictable.

Regarding claim 13, Sugawara'848 teaches wherein the mail sending unit (number 1-5-2, Fig. 1, programs for controlling transmission of email, paragraph 0044) further comprises: a post-processing operation adding portion to add the specific post-processing operation to the e-mail to be sent by the sender (the setting about whether the MDN is performed or not has been made by the user through the FAX operation unit 1-2, paragraph 0078, MDN is being viewed as the post processing); and a scanning portion to read a document to be sent and to create an image data (an image of an original to be sent is read by the image reader 1-3, and the email accompanied by the read image is sent by an email transmissions control program, paragraph 0051).

Regarding claim 14, Sugawara'848 teaches wherein the mail sending unit prepares the e-mail using the image data created (an image of an original to be sent is read by the image reader 1-3, and the email accompanied by the read image is sent by an email transmissions control program, paragraph 0051), and e-mail addresses input by the sender (communication management

information is formed each time the transmission by email are executed, paragraph 0058, further, information email address of the receiver is stored in the information).

Regarding claim 15, Sugawara'848 teaches wherein the post-processing operation adding portion adds the post-processing operation by recording a command (MDN status of the transmitted email is stored, paragraph 0068) to implement the specific post-processing operation on a non-standard header of an e-mail header (parameters according to the processes of the email on the reception side are set into the disposition header, paragraph 0112);

Regarding claim 16, Sugawara'848 teaches further comprising a display unit (LCD, paragraph 0041) and wherein an input portion is attached to the display unit (key panel for inputting, paragraph 0041), the attachment of the input portion to the display unit allowing a user to enter information (enables the inputting operation, paragraph 0041).

Regarding claim 17, Sugawara'848 teaches wherein the mail receiving unit further comprises: a post-processing operation implementing portion to determine whether the post-processing operation is recorded on a non-standard header of a received e-mail (S1710, Fig. 17); and a printing (printing, paragraph 0111) portion to print out contents of the e-mail received via the e-mail receiving unit (S1711, Fig. 17).

Regarding claim 18, Sugawara'848 teaches wherein upon determining that the post-processing operation is recorded (S1710, Fig. 17), the post-processing operation implementing portion

processes (S1711, Fig. 17) the e-mail stored in the e-mail server (S1702,S1707, Fig. 17) according to the content of the e-mail (processed, paragraph 0111).

Regarding claim 19, Sugawara'848 teaches a method of post-processing an e-mail facsimile, comprising: selecting a post-processing operation of an e-mail to be sent (the setting about whether the MDN is performed or not has been made by the user through the FAX operation unit 1-2, paragraph 0078, MDN is being viewed as the post processing); recording a command in response to the selection of the post-processing operation on a non-standard header of the e-mail (parameters according to the processes of the email on the reception side are set into the disposition header, paragraph 0112); scanning a document (read by image reader, paragraph 0051); incorporating the command, the scanned document, and the non-standard header (data construction of the communication management information, Fig. 2, in addition, paragraph 0058); sending the e-mail to an e-mail server (S1702 , Fig. 17); setting a post-processing flag (MDN Request ON, paragraph 0070) and storing the post-processing information via a post processing operation implementing unit(MDN status of the transmitted email is stored, paragraph 0068); and implementing the post-processing operation by checking the post-processing flag (parameters according to the processes of the email on the reception side are set into the disposition header, paragraph 0112).

Sugawara'848 fails to teach the selection of e-mail post-processing and performing post-processing of the email based on inputted user information.

However, Harrison'623 teaches the selection of e-mail post processing and performing post-processing of the email based on inputted user information (the agent in a server unit would

append to the mail any activities the agent and/or rules have taken on the user's behalf. For example, if the user has a rule that states forward a copy on to Mary, then the Agent would append into the mail item a statement that says when the mail was received, which rule caused action to be taken, and what action was taken, column 2, lines 45-52).

Having a system of Sugawara'848 reference and then given the well-established teaching of Harrison'623 reference, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the internet facsimile system of Sugawara'848 reference to include the software intelligent agent as taught by Harrison'623 reference since each element would have performed the same function as it does separately and the results of the combination would have been predictable.

Regarding claim 20, Sugawara'848 teaches a method of post-processing an e-mail facsimile, comprising: determining whether a post processing operation exists (S1710, Fig. 17) in a received e-mail by checking a non-standard header of an e-mail (parameters according to the processes of the email on the reception side are set into the disposition header, paragraph 0112); setting a post-processing flag (MDN Request ON, paragraph 0070) and storing the post-processing information (MDN status of the transmitted email is stored, paragraph 0068); and implementing the post-processing operation by checking the post-processing flag (S1710, Yes if MDN On, to S1711, Fig. 17).

Sugawara'848 fails to teach the determination of e-mail post-processing and performing post-processing of the email based on inputted user information.

However, Harrison'623 teaches the determination of e-mail post processing and performing post-processing of the email based on inputted user information (the agent in a server unit would append to the mail any activities the agent and/or rules have taken on the user's behalf. For example, if the user has a rule that states forward a copy on to Mary, then the Agent would append into the mail item a statement that says when the mail was received, which rule caused action to be taken, and what action was taken, column 2, lines 45-52).

Having a system of Sugawara'848 reference and then given the well-established teaching of Harrison'623 reference, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the internet facsimile system of Sugawara'848 reference to include the software intelligent agent as taught by Harrison'623 reference since each element would have performed the same function as it does separately and the results of the combination would have been predictable.

Regarding claim 21, Sugawara'848 teaches a mail receiving unit in an e-mail facsimile machine (Internet facsimile apparatus, paragraph 0038), comprising:
a post-processing operation implementing portion to determine whether a post processing operation is recorded on a non-standard header of a received e-mail (S1710, Fig. 17); and
a printing (printing, paragraph 0111) portion to print out contents of the e-mail received (S1711, Fig. 17).

Sugawara'848 fails to teach the determination of e-mail post-processing and performing post-processing of the email based on inputted user information.

However, Harrison'623 teaches the determination of e-mail post processing and performing post-processing of the email based on inputted user information (the agent in a server unit would append to the mail any activities the agent and/or rules have taken on the user's behalf. For example, if the user has a rule that states forward a copy on to Mary, then the Agent would append into the mail item a statement that says when the mail was received, which rule caused action to be taken, and what action was taken, column 2, lines 45-52).

Having a system of Sugawara'848 reference and then given the well-established teaching of Harrison'623 reference, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the internet facsimile system of Sugawara'848 reference to include the software intelligent agent as taught by Harrison'623 reference since each element would have performed the same function as it does separately and the results of the combination would have been predictable.

Regarding claim 22, Sugawara'848 teaches a mail sending unit in an e-mail facsimile machine (Internet facsimile apparatus, paragraph 0038), comprising: a post-processing operation adding portion to add the specific post-processing operation to an e-mail to be sent (the setting about whether the MDN is performed or not has been made by the user through the FAX operation unit 1-2, paragraph 0078, MDN is being viewed as the post processing); and a scanning portion to read a document to be sent and to create an image data (read by image reader and the email accompanied by the read image is sent, paragraph 0051).

Sugawara'848 fails to teach the addition of e-mail post-processing and performing post-processing of the email based on inputted user information.

However, Harrison'623 teaches the addition of e-mail post processing and performing post-processing of the email based on inputted user information (the agent in a server unit would append to the mail any activities the agent and/or rules have taken on the user's behalf. For example, if the user has a rule that states forward a copy on to Mary, then the Agent would append into the mail item a statement that says when the mail was received, which rule caused action to be taken, and what action was taken, column 2, lines 45-52).

Having a system of Sugawara'848 reference and then given the well-established teaching of Harrison'623 reference, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the internet facsimile system of Sugawara'848 reference to include the software intelligent agent as taught by Harrison'623 reference since each element would have performed the same function as it does separately and the results of the combination would have been predictable.

Conclusion

4. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to LAWRENCE E. WILLS whose telephone number is (571)270-3145. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 9:30 AM - 6:00 PM EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, King Poon can be reached on 571-272-7440. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/King Y. Poon/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2625

LEW
September 3, 2008